UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,835	11/19/2003	Kazuhito Gassho	Q78470	3632

72875 7590 12/24/2008

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, ALLEN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@sughrue.com
kghyndman@sughrue.com
USPatDocketing@sughrue.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/715,835	GASSHO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allen H. Nguyen	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,8 and 10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,8 and 10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 June 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- This office action is responsive to the following communication:

  Amendment filed on 10/03/2008.

- Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10 are currently pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/03/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. With respect to applicants' argument that "Suzuki does not teach or suggest the generation module of the present invention that extracts the page attribute information from the print job, and generates inclusive page attribute information by merging the extracted multi pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information, which contains the page attribute information for all pages of the print job".

In reply: Regarding claim 1, Suzuki '163 does not explicitly show a generation module that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page from said print job and generates inclusive page attribute information by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information, which contains said page attribute information for all pages of the print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Nakagiri '562. In particular, Nakagiri '562 teaches a generation module (CPU 201 of computer 100, figs. 1-2) that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute

information for each page (Page Attribute 303A, fig. 3A) from said print job (Book Attribute 301, fig. 3A) and generates inclusive page attribute information (Page Attribute 1 – Page Attribute 4, fig. 3A) by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information (304, fig. 3B), which contains said page attribute information for all pages of the print job (see col. 7, lines 1-35, fig. 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (US 6,606,163) in view of Nakagiri et al. (US 7,394,562).

Regarding claim 1, Suzuki '163 discloses a print job management device (Print Processing device, fig. 27) that manages print jobs, comprising:

an input module (Job Acceptance section 201, fig. 27) that inputs a print job of printing a plurality of pages (i.e., the job acceptance section 201 accepts a job input from a client workstation through a network N and unifies various types of format of received jobs into a job format defined by this print processing device; Col. 41, lines 60-65), the print job including a plurality of document data and multiple pieces of document attribute information for each document (i.e., the printing system effects printing of the

plurality of documents corresponding to attributes of the documents under control of a job scheduling device; See Abstract), each document data representing one of the plurality of documents (Figs. 30A-30C), the page attribute information being disposed at a header portion of each document of the print job (i.e., data 280 delivered from the client is made up of a job attribute 281 which servers as a header of the data; Col. 44, lines 65-67 and col. 45, lines 1-35, fig. 30A);

a communication module (Object Processing section 208, fig. 27) that, before transmitting the print job to a printer (Job Execution Section 204, lines 25-28, fig. 27), transmits only the inclusive document attribute information to the printer (i.e., the object processing section 208 reads document attribute, such as the location of document data and paper size on which the data are printed, from the object file 209 and sends that document attribute to the job execution section 204; Col. 42, lines 62-65) to cause the printer to determine whether or not the printer is capable of executing the print job (When the request control section 211 accepted a job, it is checked whether or not the attributes, i.e., parameters of the job and a document of that job are valid before the job is processed by the job scheduling section 212 as step S1 of fig. 31; Col. 45, lines 48-51, fig. 28).

Suzuki '163 does not explicitly show a generation module that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page from said print job and generates inclusive page attribute information by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information, which contains said page attribute information for all pages of the print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Nakagiri '562. In particular, Nakagiri '562 teaches a generation module (CPU 201 of computer 100, figs. 1-2) that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page (Page Attribute 303A, fig. 3A) from said print job (Book Attribute 301, fig. 3A) and generates inclusive page attribute information (Page Attribute 1 – Page Attribute 4, fig. 3A) by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information (304, fig. 3B), which contains said page attribute information for all pages of the print job (see col. 7, lines 1-35, fig. 6).

In view of the above, having the system of Suzuki and then given the well-established teaching of Nakagiri, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Suzuki as taught by Nakagiri to include: a generation module that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page from said print job and generates inclusive page attribute information by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information, which contains said page attribute information for all pages of the print job, since Nakagiri stated in col. 2, lines 60-65 that such a modification would show designation means for designating a page to be printed by a serial number of a print paper sheet to be printed by the printing apparatus.

Regarding claim 3, Suzuki '163 discloses a print job management device (Print Processing device, fig. 27), wherein said generation module (Object Management Section 210d, fig. 27) further attaches said inclusive attribute information to a header of

said print job (i.e., data 280 delivered from the client is made up of a job attribute 281 which serves as a header of the data, and a number of document data items (n) 282-1, 282-2, . . . 282-n which serve as a data portion of the data. A document attribute is added to substance of each of the document data items 282-2, 282-2, . . . 282-n; see col. 44, lines 66-67 and col. 45, lines 1-5, fig. 30A).

Regarding claim 4, Suzuki '163 discloses a print job management device (Print Processing device, fig. 27), further comprising: a status management module (Queue Management Section 214, fig. 28) that manages said print job in coordination with a predetermined status (i.e., Scheduling is carried out allowing for an assignment and processing conditions of the job execution section, and a print processing request is issued to the job execution section by transferring a job stored in the queue management section 214 to the job execution section; Col. 16, lines 10-15, fig. 28);

wherein if said print job is in a status of contents analysis (A job status which is carried out by an attribution modification section, figs. 45-46), said generation module performs said extraction in conjunction with said analysis (see col. 16, lines 15-25).

Regarding claim 8, claim 8 is the method claim of device claim 1. Therefore, method claim 8 is rejected for the reason given in device claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, Suzuki '163 discloses a program code (Job Acceptance section 201, fig. 27) that inputs a print job of printing a plurality of pages (i.e., the job

acceptance section 201 accepts a job input from a client workstation through a network N and unifies various types of format of received jobs into a job format defined by this print processing device; Col. 41, lines 60-65), the print job including a plurality of document data and multiple pieces of document attribute information for each document (i.e., the printing system effects printing of the plurality of documents corresponding to attributes of the documents under control of a job scheduling device; See Abstract), each document data representing one of the plurality of documents (Figs. 30A-30C), the document attribute information being disposed at each document of the print job (i.e., data 280 delivered from the client is made up of a job attribute 281 which servers as a header of the data; Col. 44, lines 65-67 and col. 45, lines 1-35, fig. 30A);

a program code (Object Processing section 208, fig. 27) that, before transmitting the print job to the printer (Job Execution Section 204, lines 25-28, fig. 27), transmits a signal representing only the inclusive document attribute information to the printer (i.e., the object processing section 208 reads document attribute, such as the location of document data and paper size on which the data are printed, from the object file 209 and sends that document attribute to the job execution section 204; Col. 42, lines 62-65) to cause the printer to determine whether or not the printer is capable of executing the print job (When the request control section 211 accepted a job, it is checked whether or not the attributes, i.e., parameters of the job and a document of that job are valid before the job is processed by the job scheduling section 212 as step S1 of fig. 31; Col. 45, lines 48-51, fig. 28).

Suzuki '163 does not explicitly show a computer readable medium encoded with computer program for managing print jobs for use in a computer, the computer being coupled to a printer which is separate from the computer, comprising:

a program code that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page from said print job and generates inclusive page attribute information by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information, which contains said attribute information.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Nakagiri '562. In particular, Nakagiri '562 teaches a computer readable medium encoded with computer program for managing print jobs for use in a computer (A computer program stored in a computer-readable storage medium for causing a computer to set, for document data including a plurality of original pages, print setting information including print format setting information to be applied to print processing performed by a printing apparatus; Col. 26, lines 10-15), the computer (100, fig. 1) being coupled to a printer (107, fig. 1) which is separate from the computer, comprising:

a program code (CPU 201 of computer 100, figs. 1-2) that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page (Page Attribute 303A, fig. 3A) from said print job (Book Attribute 301, fig. 3A) and generates inclusive page attribute information (Page Attribute 1 – Page Attribute 4, fig. 3A) by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information (304, fig. 3B), which contains said attribute information (see col. 7, lines 1-35, fig. 6).

In view of the above, having the system of Suzuki and then given the well-established teaching of Nakagiri, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Suzuki as taught by Nakagiri to include: a computer readable medium encoded with computer program for managing print jobs for use in a computer, the computer being coupled to a printer which is separate from the computer. A program code that extracts said multiple pieces of page attribute information for each page from said print job and generates inclusive page attribute information by merging the extracted multiple pieces of page attribute into said inclusive page attribute information, which contains said attribute information, since Nakagiri stated in col. 2, lines 60-65 that such a modification would show designation means for designating a page to be printed by a serial number of a print paper sheet to be printed by the printing apparatus.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shima (US 6,876,464) discloses printer, recording medium and printer memory management method.

Jackelen et al. (US 2003/0053810) discloses method of resolving mismatches between printer resources and print job requirements.

Boswell (US 5,559,933) discloses distributed enterprise print controller.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)270-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KING Y. POON can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Allen H. Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625